DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 486 CE 073 050

AUTHOR	Bourque, Blair B.; And Others
TITLE	A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates. National Institute of Justice Research Brief.
INSTITUTION	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. National Inst. of Justice.
REPORT NO	NCJ-157664
PUB DATE	May 96
CONTRACT	92-DD-CX-K043
NOTE	17p.; For a related document, see CE 073 051.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Institutions; *Correctional Rehabilitation; *Juvenile Justice; *Probationary Period; Recidivism; Secondary Education; Transitional Programs; Youth Problems; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Jail Boot Camps

ABSTRACT

A study used a three-tiered process to identify the range of available aftercare programming in 52 correctional boot camps. The process included a telephone survey, creation of boot camp and aftercare program summaries, and site visits. Existing research indicated that boot camps were not necessarily lowering rates of recidivism, but this situation could result from shortcomings in aftercare programs for boot camp graduates. Findings indicated the following: 13 boot camps had specialized aftercare programs; 18 had no special requirements; and 21 had a specified aftercare regimen, sometimes with specific aspects for boot camp graduates. Specialized care was limited by structural and statutory constraints. Sparsely populated states may have too few boot camp graduates in one location to maintain a specialized program. For the majority of boot camps, integration of the boot camp experience and aftercare consisted of joint participation in prerelease planning. Most released from boot camp were placed on intensive probation/parole in their communities; emphasis was on intensive supervision rather than intensive services. Six programs required time in a residential transitional program and a few others offered transitional programing to certain types of offenders. Few programs had developed structures for monitoring and evaluating boot camp graduates in aftercare. (Nineteen notes, including some references, are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

ED 401 486

National Institute of Justice

Research in Brief

Jeremy Travis, Director

May 1996

Issues and Findings

Discussed in this Brief: Results of an NIJ-sponsored survey of 52 boot camps and their aftercare programs, conducted by the American Institutes for Research.

Key issues: Research has indicated that boot camps are not necessarily lowering rates of recidivism, but this situation may be the result of shortcomings in aftercare programs for boot camp graduates. The study analyzed five aspects of aftercare:

- Extent to which aftercare provisions have been expressly designed for boot camp graduates.
- Continuity and interaction between boot camp and aftercare.
- Intensity and length of supervision.
- Provisions for gradual decreases in the structure provided.
- Provisions for monitoring and evaluation of the boot camp and aftercare programs.

Key findings:

- Thirteen boot camps (seven statewide adult programs, three juvenile programs, and three local programs in one State) had specialized aftercare programs for boot camp graduates. Eighteen had no special requirements, and 21 had a specified aftercare regimen, sometimes with specific aspects for boot camp graduates.

continued . . .

CE 073 050

A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates

by Blair B. Bourque, Mei Han, and Sarah M. Hill

Over the past decade, the Nation's prison population has increased 150 percent,[1] and prisons, jails, and juvenile correctional facilities are bursting at the seams. Under these conditions, many State legislatures and correctional officials have seized upon shock incarceration, or correctional boot camps, as a quick solution to overcrowding. Boot camp programs, characterized by a strong emphasis on military structure, drill, and discipline, and an abbreviated period of incarceration, promise immediate savings in prison costs resulting from early releases, without appearing to coddle criminals.

Recidivism rates have not declined (see "Growth of Boot Camps," page 7), which research findings indicate is partly a result of inadequate aftercare. For example, boot camps in New York, Illinois, and Louisiana that reported lower recidivism rates than their prison counterparts each maintained a 6-month intensive supervision phase in the community. Researchers suggest that the lower recidivism rates at these sites were "very likely due to the type of community supervision and not the in-prison phase of the program." The study also found that the more intensively offenders were supervised after their releases, the better they adjusted.[2]

Another study of substance abuse programs in shock incarceration facilities found that few had developed formal links with drug treatment providers in the community. Many released offenders to traditional probation or parole supervision. To deliver effective substance abuse programs, the study suggested development of "improved aftercare programs and linkages between the imprisonment and community release phases of the boot camp sanction."[3]

These findings—a consensus among boot camp providers that aftercare may have been shortchanged—prompted the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to examine boot camp aftercare programs. The American Institutes for Research conducted a survey of aftercare programs from May through December 1994 in conjunction with NIJ's broad boot camp research agenda. After describing the survey method, this Research in Brief describes the types of aftercare programs available to graduates of boot camps across the Nation, identifies critical issues in boot camp aftercare programming, and highlights several innovative or promising program features.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Issues and Findings

continued . . .

- Specialized care is limited by structural and statutory constraints. For example, one agency may be responsible for incarceration while another is responsible for probationary programs.

- Sparsely populated States may have too few boot camp graduates in one location to maintain a specialized program.

- For the majority of boot camps, integration of the boot camp experience and aftercare consists of joint participation in prerelease planning.

- Most of those released from boot camp are placed on intensive probation/parole in their communities; the emphasis is on intensive supervision rather than intensive services.

- Six programs require time in a residential transitional program (such as a halfway house) and a few others offer transitional programming to certain types of offenders (e.g., drug offenders or those with inappropriate home supervision).

- Few programs have developed structures for monitoring and evaluating boot camp graduates in aftercare.

Although recidivism rates appear lower for boot camps offering specialized programs, definitive studies have yet to be performed. However, this survey found a number of models for integrating aftercare functions with boot camps that appear to hold promise for retaining the benefits of the boot camp experience when the graduate reenters the community.

Target audience: Corrections officials, State and local policymakers, and researchers.

Methodology

The study employed a three-tiered process to identify the range of available aftercare programming. The process included a telephone survey, creation of boot camp and aftercare program summaries, and site visits.

In May and June 1994, initial telephone interviews were conducted with boot camp administrators identified through two previous surveys—a 1993 mail survey of State correctional departments and a 1992 telephone survey of juvenile correctional departments. In most cases a second telephone interview was conducted with a parole, probation, or other official responsible for aftercare. Information from these sources was combined to create individual case summaries of the programs, which were then submitted for each boot camp's review. Representatives from each of the programs approved the descriptions.

Site visits were conducted at three boot camps—the Minnesota Challenge Incarceration Program, Maryland's Herman L. Toulson Boot Camp, and the Kentucky First Incarceration Shock Treatment (FIST) Program—and the aftercare programs located in the proximate urban areas of Minneapolis, Baltimore, and Louisville. The focus of each visit was to determine the links between the boot camp and the aftercare program and to document the breadth and intensity of services and surveillance provided in aftercare. Each site visit included interviews with key project staff members at the boot camp and the aftercare program, a review of archival data, and observations of program activities.

Boot camps surveyed

The boot camps surveyed in July 1994 included 34 programs operated by State correctional departments; the Federal Bureau of Prisons' program; 8 programs operated by local departments of corrections, sheriff's departments, or parole/probation departments; and 9 juvenile programs. This group represents most of the boot camps in operation.[4]

Juvenile programs are operated by a variety of agencies. Sheriff's departments operate the four Florida programs, and private agencies administer the State of Colorado and the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, Juvenile Court programs. The Boys and Girls Clubs of Mobile, the Strickland Youth Center, and the University of South Alabama jointly run the Alabama juvenile camp, and the California Youth Authority operates its own boot camp.

Data on the age of the programs and the operating capacity (see table 1) confirm the continuing popularity of boot camps. Thirty of the 52 programs have opened since 1991. State programs account for most of the operating capacity, with 9,304 beds available, primarily for males.

Because the juvenile programs tended to be smaller than the State level programs, usually with operating capacities between 30 and 60 beds, they accounted for a relatively small proportion of the boot camp beds in the survey. Local programs reflected a wider range in size (e.g., the Harris County, Texas, program can accommodate 384 individuals compared to 15 in the Brazos County, Texas, program) and a dramatic increase in numbers. For example, a 1993 study identified only 3 jail boot camps in Texas,[5] but by 1995 officials reported 14 boot camps operating there.

Table 1: ***Characteristics of Boot Camp Programs***

	Federal and State[1] (n=35)	Local (n=8)	Juvenile (n=9)
Year Opened			
Prior to 1988	7	0	0
1988–1990	13	2	0
1991–1993	14	6	6
1994	1	0	3
Capacity[2]			
Male	8,678	806	455
Female	626	102	0
Total Capacity	9,304	908	455
Minimum length of residential boot camp			
< 3 months	2	4	1
3 months	15	2	2
4 months	9	0	5
6 months	9	2	1

[1] There were 32 States known to operate boot camps at the time of the study. Since both Georgia and Oklahoma operate two different types of boot camps, they are treated separately in the table.

[2] When a program did not break out male and female capacity, it was counted as being male. Therefore, the female capacities may be undercounted.

Whereas most boot camps, particularly the older programs, initially limited participation to males, a substantial number of the programs have expanded to include females. The Federal program, 18 of the 34 State programs, and 4 of the 8 local programs have designated some beds for women, although the total female capacity is only a fraction of the total capacity. The 44-bed Practical Regimented Rehabilitation for Inmates Determined to Excel (PRIDE) program in Santa Clara, California, takes women only. Most of the programs that serve women and men maintain entirely separate facilities. Some, however, such as the FIST Program in Kentucky, integrate females into the regular platoon structure and only segregate the living quarters.

The majority of boot camps exclude violent offenders and those whose sentences are longer than a predetermined maximum, commonly in the 5- to 10-year range (see table 2, page 4). State programs frequently exclude offenders with a prior incarceration from consideration and require that participants volunteer for the program. The majority of programs also have set a maximum age for eligibility, typically between ages 25 and 35.

Overview of existing aftercare provisions

In general, graduates of boot camps are nonviolent, young adult (or juvenile) offenders serving their first incarceration. At this point, they have completed a short but rigorous program that places rigid external controls on behavior. In exchange, they are being released into the community far sooner than their original sentences would have permitted.

To the extent that the boot camp approach differs from those employed by other correctional programs, one would expect that the aftercare programming would reflect these differences.

What then happens to the boot camp graduates when they return to the community? The quasi-military activities, physical regimen, and intense structure that distinguish boot camps from other correctional interventions do not extend to most aftercare programs. Once individuals graduate from boot camp, they are typically integrated with releasees from other institutions. Of the 52 boot camp programs contacted, 18 had no specific requirements or programming for boot camp graduates (see table 3, page 5). Once an individual is released from boot camp, a decision is made as to whether to place him or her on standard or intensive supervision. Often this decision depends on whether intensive supervision is available where the boot camp graduate is released.

Existing research on aftercare provisions

Existing research on aftercare has indicated the importance of tailoring the community portion of an intervention to the specific strategy employed by the institution. One technique recommended for reinforcing and monitoring skills learned in the institution in the community is to employ individualized case planning from the point of commitment until release from supervision.[6]

In order to adequately reinforce and monitor skills built while incarcerated, research also highlights the need for employing intensive services as well as intensive surveillance. The latter would serve to flag problem areas that

Table 2: ***Eligibility Criteria for Boot Camps***

Eligibility Requirements	Federal and State (n=35)	Local (n=8)	Juvenile (n=9)
Maximum age			NA[1]
25 or under	7	3	
26–30	8	1	
31–35	7	0	
36–40	3	0	
No limit	10[2]	4	
Maximum sentence			NA[1]
Between 1 and 4 years	9	1	
Between 5 and 10 years	15	1	
Other[3]	11	6	
Requirement that enrollment be voluntary[4]	27	6	3
Exclude those with			
Prior incarceration	23	1	0
Violent crimes	33	6	3

[1] For juvenile programs the maximum age is the age of juvenile court jurisdiction, typically age 17. Minimum ages for these programs are 14 for six programs, 12 for one, 13 for one, and 16 for one. Sentence requirements do not apply.

[2] Includes the Federal program, which does not exclude older offenders but does give priority to offenders under age 36, and the Michigan program, which only accepts *probationers* under age 26 but accepts *inmates* of any age.

[3] Includes programs with sentences greater than 10 years and those with no maximums.

[4] Does not include two programs (Arizona and Hidalgo County, Texas) that do not have voluntary requirements but most of the participants do volunteer.

would be managed through a referral system employing incentives and graduated consequences. Other principles of effective aftercare address the extent to which programs take advantage of existing community resources and the extent to which they employ a system of program evaluation and management information.[7]

These findings, along with suggestions from boot camp program and aftercare staff during the first round of interviews, led to an examination of the following aspects of aftercare:

- Extent to which aftercare provisions have been expressly designed for boot camp graduates.
- Continuity and interaction between boot camp and aftercare.
- Intensity and length of supervision.
- Provisions for gradual decreases in the structure provided.
- Breadth and frequency of services provided.
- Provisions for monitoring and evaluation of the boot camp and aftercare programs.

Aftercare designed for boot camp graduates

Challenges. Structural, logistical, and statutory constraints limit boot camp providers' ability to offer graduates specialized aftercare programs. In many cases the correctional system places the responsibility for post-release services and supervision outside the branch or agency that operates the correctional institutions. Because different agencies are responsible for the transition to the community, coherent programs are difficult to develop. In some locations the program establishes the rules for aftercare options; in others the judge resentences the individual who has completed boot camp; and in still others the parole board or another governing entity decides where to place the graduate.

Geography poses problems for many boot camps, particularly the State programs that serve broad jurisdictions. Individuals may be released to counties dispersed across too wide an area to make congregation of boot camp graduates possible. In States such as Georgia or New York,[8] where many individuals are released from boot camps monthly, there may be enough cases in each county to warrant specialized services. In large States with small programs such as Montana,[9] boot camp releasees are dispersed too widely and sparsely for such programs to make sense.

Specific requirements rather than specialized programs. These difficulties have led many programs to set specific requirements for the type of supervision or services that should be available in the community instead of developing specialized programs. Almost half of the surveyed programs take this approach and release graduates to existing transitional programs or probation or parole structures where there is no distinction made between boot camp graduates and other offenders. The statewide programs usually

Table 3: ***Special Boot Camp Aftercare Programs and Requirements***

	Federal/State Programs (n=35)[1]	Local Programs (n=8)	Juvenile Programs (n=9)	TOTALS
No special requirements or programming for boot camp graduates specified	AL, AR, CO, FL[2], GA-I[3], ID, MS, NV, NC, OK-SIP, SC, TX, WI, WY 14	CA-Santa Clara MI-Pontiac TX-Brazos County 3	CO-Golden 1	18
Aftercare regimen specified, but no separate program for boot camp graduates	CA, GA-P, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, MT, OK-RID[3], OR, PA, TN, VA, FEDERAL 14	NY-Nassau NY-Riker's Island 2	GA-LEAD FL-Manatee County FL-Martin County FL-Pinellas County FL-Leon County 5	21
Aftercare program designed and operated exclusively for boot camp graduates	AZ-Maricopa County MD-Baltimore MI MN-St. Paul NH NY-New York City OH 7	TX-Travis TX-Hidalgo TX-Harris County 3	AL-Mobile OH-Cuyahoga County NY-South Kortwright 3	13

[1] Georgia and Oklahoma operate two different types of programs: George Inmate (GA-I) and George Probation (GA-P); and Oklahoma Regimented Inmate Discipline (OK-RID) and Oklahoma Shock Incarceration (OK-SIP).

[2] Beginning July 1995, boot camp graduates will be required to spend 4–6 months in community residential centers before they are released to the community.

[3] For inmates on community custody only; inmates with delayed incarceration sentences are resentenced at the conclusion of boot camp.

require that graduates be placed on intensive supervision for a set period before moving to regular supervision for the remainder of their sentences. The Labette Correctional Conservation Camp in Kansas, the FIST Program in Kentucky, and the Oregon Success Using Motivation, Morale, Intensity, and Treatment (SUMMIT) Program mandate intensive supervision where it is available.[10]

Many statewide programs have set requirements beyond intensive supervision. For instance, the Massachusetts Boot Camp requires that graduates attend five Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) or Narcotics Anonymous (NA) meetings per week, adhere to a curfew, and submit to urine tests. Requirements beyond intensive supervision for graduates of Louisiana's IMPACT Program include performing 100 hours of unpaid community service work, abiding by a curfew, and meeting with a parole officer at least 4 times a week. The Illinois Impact Incarceration Program adds electronic monitoring to the intensive supervision criteria.

The most stringent of the requirements for boot camp graduates includes time in a work furlough or other transitional residential facility. The Federal intensive confinement centers release all graduates to the community correctional center located closest to their residences, mixing boot camp graduates with releasees from other Bureau of Prisons institutions. During the first aftercare phase, inmates may only leave the facility for employment or to take advantage of special program services. Then they reach prerelease status where they may receive passes for visits but are required to return to the center at night. During the last phase, they are released to home confinement under intensive supervision, including the use of electronic monitoring. Other programs with a mandatory stay in a transitional center include the San Quentin Alternative Sentencing Program in California, the Swan River Correctional Training Center in Montana, the Leon County, Florida, Juvenile Boot Camp, and the Oklahoma Regimented Inmate Discipline (RID) Program. For the Leon County program, the requirement only applies to those participants who are committed to the Department of Corrections and who are not required to serve additional time in a minimum security institution after boot camp.

Several programs have set different types of requirements. The two local programs in New York, which target parole violators who have substance abuse problems, require that graduates participate in drug treatment programs. Tennessee's Special Alternative Incarceration Unit exacts 8 hours of community service per month until the expiration of the parolee's sentence unless the parole officer waives the requirement. The three Florida

juvenile boot camps in Manatee, Martin, and Pinellas Counties require participation in a day treatment program under contract with local agencies.

Specialized programs. Thirteen programs (seven statewide adult programs, three local adult programs, and three juvenile programs) have developed aftercare models specifically for boot camp. Five of the seven statewide programs that offer specialized aftercare programs for boot camp graduates have capitalized on the fact that most of the boot camp population reside in the most populous metropolitan area of the State. The New York State Division of Parole accommodates about two-thirds of the Shock Incarceration releasees in its Manhattan Aftershock Bureau staffed by 44 parole officers. Considered to be the standard by which other programs are judged, this program provides multifaceted services through subcontracts with community agencies.

Aftershock programs following a similar model, but on a smaller scale in line with much smaller boot camp capacities, include:

- The Minnesota Department of Corrections' aftercare program for the 70 percent of its boot camp graduates residing in the 7-county area around Minneapolis-St. Paul.
- The Maryland Department of Probation and Parole's two aftercare programs in Baltimore and Prince George's Counties.
- The Maricopa County, Arizona, Department of Probation's program for shock probationers.

In all four of these boot camp programs, graduates who fall outside of the area targeted for specialized services are highly supervised, either on intensive caseloads or through assignment to small caseloads. Michigan has developed a residential aftercare program for boot camp graduates in its most populous county, but mixes boot camp graduates with other parolees once they are released to the community.

Thirteen specialized programs

New York. Release is granted for 99 percent of the Shock graduates of New York's four Shock Incarceration facilities when presented to the board. Parolees in New York City are released to the supervision of the Division of Parole's intensive aftershock monitoring program for 6 months before completing the remainder of their sentences on traditional parole supervision.

Two-person parole officer teams are responsible for caseloads of 38 parolees from proximate neighborhoods. Monitoring includes random urinalysis, curfew checks, employment and other verifications, as well as home visits (jointly conducted by both officers on the team). Parolees attend evening sessions held 4 nights a week.

In addition to the more intensive supervision, the program offers a range of supplementary services through community agencies, which include job placement, employment counseling, vocational testing, and on-the-job training services. All Shock parolees also receive initial substance abuse assessments and weekly relapse prevention counseling sessions organized by platoon. Other weekly counseling Network sessions[11] continue the boot camp program. Attendance at these sessions is mandatory for the first 3 months after release.

The program reports that the boot camp parolees have higher rates of employment and enrollment in community programs at the 6-month mark and higher rates of remaining in the community at the 1-year mark than comparable groups of parolees. The department estimates that for every 100 Shock inmates released, it saves more than $2 million in inmate costs.

Minnesota. Since boot camp and aftercare are perceived to be different stages of a coherent program, Minnesota Challenge Incarceration Program (CIP) boot camp and the aftercare staff participate in integrated planning and staffing sessions during the boot camp phase. There is a concerted effort to blend the boot camp philosophy into aftercare with an emphasis on group problem solving. Those parolees who are unable to obtain the requisite employment are referred to job-training programs.

The Department of Corrections operates CIP and the two-phase aftercare program. Three CIP staff members working out of the Minneapolis-St. Paul office provide direct supervision of the graduates in the surrounding seven-county area, as well as link offenders in nonmetropolitan areas with local programs and resources to meet supervision requirements. These agents review the progress of participants and make decisions about their release from boot camp subject to approval of the Office of Adult Release. About 78 percent of the participants complete the residential boot camp phase of the program.

CIP agents use a case management approach to arrange for aftercare services. Many activities, such as acupuncture therapy, cognitive training sessions, and chemical dependency training, span both phases. For the first

6 months after release from boot camp, offenders in the metropolitan area must contact a reporting center daily, submit weekly schedules, and abide by curfews. With caseloads averaging 14 parolees, CIP agents can make random and unannounced contacts and phone calls to ensure compliance with the rules and to conduct random drug and alcohol tests. Upon release from this phase of aftercare, each parolee is assigned to an agent in his own community. The designated parole agent determines the appropriate level of supervision for the remainder of the sentence, subject to the review of the Office of Adult Release.

Maryland. The State graduates about 73 percent of those enrolled in its 6-month boot camp. The conditions of release, including a date for parole if the conditions are met, are established before entry to boot camp under a mutual agreement contract. The boot camp staff determines if individuals have met their conditions and are eligible for release.

Aftercare is the responsibility of the Department of Probation and Parole. Two parole officers are assigned to the boot camp to develop the prerelease plans for each inmate, including the transition to the community. Special boot camp aftercare programs operate in the population centers of Baltimore and Prince George's Counties, with designated parole officers and activities. (In the remainder of the State, parolees are assigned to intensive parole supervision along with parolees from institutions that are not boot camps.)

In the Baltimore aftercare program, the Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development also assigns two staff members to work with boot camp parolees. Participating parolees

Growth of Boot Camps

Beginning with a 50-bed program in Georgia in 1983,[12] boot camps have proliferated to 52 programs in 32 States and the Federal Bureau of Prisons in 1993.[13] Capacity has also expanded, with Georgia and New York operating more than 1,000 beds each. Initially operated by State departments of corrections for young males convicted of nonviolent offenses, boot camps now encompass a broader spectrum of offenders, including juveniles and women, and are operated by State juvenile, local, and Federal agencies.

Most programs portray boot camps as an alternative to long-term incarceration that develops self esteem, responsibility, discipline, and a work ethic in participants and increases their academic and job-related skills. Although military-like activities define the boot camps, the programs differ in the importance they place on their military and nonmilitary agendas. Most programs include physical training, manual labor assignments, some type of counseling, General Equivalency Diploma (GED) programs, and life skills courses. Some programs put a military veneer over a broad-based theory of behavior change and management, but many emphasize the military regimen as their central feature. These program features are expected to develop self-esteem, responsibility, and discipline of participants, and thereby reduce recidivism among boot camp graduates. A second set of goals, shared by most of the adult programs, is to reduce correctional costs and overcrowding by shortening the time a prisoner stays in an institution.

The emerging literature on boot camp effectiveness supports the notion that these programs can reduce prison overcrowding and costs because offenders serve less time in boot camp than they would have served in prison. The net cost benefit is affected, of course, by the number of inmates in boot camp and the length of the prison terms they would have otherwise served.[14]

Boot camps, however, have been less successful in reducing recidivism. On the one hand, documented improvements in graduates' social attitudes, educational achievement, and physical fitness over the course of boot camp offer promise for their performance in the community. On the other, the research to date has found little indication that time at the camps alters the criminal behavior of graduates once they have been released. A 1994 review of the literature about boot camps concluded there is no clear evidence that boot camps reduce recidivism.[15] The most comprehensive evaluation to date, which assessed eight programs, discovered the recidivism rates of boot camp graduates and offenders who spent more time in prison to be nearly the same.[16]

are given assistance in locating employment and enrolling in job-training programs. Other aftercare services include weekly aftercare support group meetings, community service projects, weekly substance abuse training and counseling sessions to complete the 9-month curriculum initiated during boot camp, and a mentoring program.

The program reports a recidivism rate of 19.6 percent; about 3 out of 4 of these offenders committed technical violations of parole. The return rate is lower for participants in the Baltimore aftercare program than for other Maryland boot camp graduates. Baltimore participants also are more likely to be employed or to be enrolled in school.

Arizona. Arizona's program is similar to the three described above. Its aftercare arrangements include use of a dedicated aftershock program in a metropolitan area. However, Arizona's aftercare arrangements are more complex than those of the other three programs because the requirements and supervisory agency differ, depending on whether graduates were sentenced to the program as a condition of intensive probation or were diverted from the prison system. Aftercare for probationers is the responsibility of the Department of Probation in each individual's county of origin, and for inmates it is the responsibility of the Parole Division of the Department of Corrections. About 95 percent of the boot camp population is sentenced to boot camp as a condition of intensive probation.

Shock releasees under the supervision of the Department of Corrections are assigned to parole officers who maintain caseloads of about 85 parolees. For the first 90 days after release, they are placed under house arrest and electronically monitored. Then they are released to general supervision for the remainder of their sentences and required to report twice a week to their assigned officers.

Intensive probation supervision lasts for 9 to 12 months. In Maricopa County, an aftershock team develops individual treatment plans for each probationer. There are 3 phases of supervision, beginning with 90 to 120 days in either a community house arrest program or a transitional shock house. During this period, probationers must contact their probation offices 4 times a week. In the subsequent 3 months, their contact requirements are reduced to 3 per week, and finally to 1 per week for the final 3 months. Participants are subject to random drug testing.

Boot camp probationers are required to maintain full-time employment and to provide 40 hours of community service. Program activities in the shock probation aftercare program include: educational classes such as GED preparation, Adult Basic Education (ABE); typing; parenting classes; substance abuse classes; self-help groups; family counseling; recreational activities; and group physical training.

The program reports a prison return rate of 32 percent, with the Maricopa County shock probationers reporting only a 12 percent return rate.

Michigan. Michigan requires three phases of aftercare: a period in a residential aftercare center, a period of intensive supervision in the community, and a period of regular supervision for the balance of the sentence. Assignment to a residential aftercare center is agreed to by the sentencing court as part of admission to the program, either as a condition of probation or as a condition of parole.

Boot camp graduates spend up to 90 days in either an existing probation residential center or the special Wayne County residential facility for boot camp graduates which accommodates about a third of the boot camp population. Program elements in the Wayne County facility borrow extensively from the boot camp, permitting a gradual weaning from the military structure. These elements include a highly structured environment (e.g., use of summary punishment, military rules of dress, inspections, and courtesies, such as coming to attention, saying "yes, sir," and "no, ma'am," and inspections), work details, mandatory community service, and daily physical training. In addition, the educational, substance abuse, and vocational counseling programs are integrated with those initiated at boot camp. Vocational training is emphasized, with special training provided in culinary arts and computer programming. However, boot camp graduates outside Wayne County are assigned with other released offenders to probation residential facilities, where there is no special boot camp focus or effort to wean probationers from the boot camp regimen.

After release from one of the residential facilities, offenders spend a minimum of 160 days undergoing intensive supervision. Then they are assigned to regular supervision for 14 months or the balance of the minimum sentence, whichever is longer.

Ohio. In contrast, Ohio's Shock Incarceration Program does not provide specialized aftercare solely in metropolitan areas. All participants enter a 30- to 60-day period of intermediate

transitional detention following graduation from boot camp. Simultaneously, each graduate is assigned to a parole officer. Because the halfway house exclusively serves those exiting boot camp, some of the military practices are continued. Comprehensive services include substance abuse counseling, education, and testing; life skills programming; employment services programming; and case management.

When the participant has completed a set of conditions for release from the transitional detention center, he is presented to the parole board for release. Responsibility shifts to the Adult Parole Authority, and the boot camp graduates are mainstreamed into the general parole population. Initially, shock graduates are placed on intensive supervision. At this level requirements include weekly contacts, random drug tests, participation in substance abuse counseling, and employment. After up to 6 months in intensive supervision, participants serve the remainder of their sentences on standard parole.

New Hampshire. New Hampshire's specialized aftercare, like Ohio's, targets graduates located across the entire State. For the majority of participants in New Hampshire's 120-day boot camp, the court has suspended a prison sentence under the condition that the individual successfully complete boot camp and serve up to 5 years on probation. For boot camp participants referred directly from the Department of Corrections, release must be approved by the parole board.

Individual graduates are assigned to an intensive or standard parole caseload in their communities. Most individuals are placed in intensive supervision for the first 90 days after release, then reduced to standard supervision. Intensive supervision caseloads typically are 12 to 25 parolees per officer and require daily contact. Standard caseloads are about 100 cases per officer, and require 1 or 2 contacts per week. Individuals with substance abuse problems are expected to participate in AA and NA groups in their communities.

Beyond the monitoring and assistance provided by local probation/parole officers, the Shock Incarceration Program operates an aftercare program expressly for boot camp graduates. Three members of the boot camp staff, the probation/parole officer and the two drug and alcohol counselors conduct biweekly meetings at a central, usually urban location. For the first 6 months after graduation, attendance is mandatory and transportation is provided.

The meetings build on the social bonds established at boot camp by uniting the platoons. The drug and alcohol counselors run group sessions similar to those conducted at boot camp, where participants discuss personal difficulties and setbacks, and confront individuals with negative attitudes. The sessions offer an opportunity to provide "refresher" substance abuse information as well.

The program's reported 2-year recidivism rate of 17 percent contrasts with the 47 percent rate for the men's prison, although the populations in these two facilities probably are not equivalent. About 24 percent of the boot camp graduates are returned on violations of probation.

Three local programs. Although local programs do not have the same geographical constraints as statewide programs in providing specialized services, only three of the eight local programs in the survey, all in Texas, have developed such services. They are the Convicted Offender Reentry Program in Austin (Travis County), the Harris County Boot Camp Program in Humble, and the Hidalgo County Boot Camp Program in Edinburg.

Travis County provides a two-phase work release program for boot camp participants before releasing them to routine probation supervision. During the first 15-day transitional phase, participants work in government or nonprofit agencies during the day and return to boot camp in the evening. At the successful conclusion of this phase, they follow a regular schedule of work or vocational programming offsite while continuing to live at boot camp.

In contrast, the Harris County and Hidalgo County boot camps release participants directly to supervision by the local probation/parole departments but require participation in special aftercare sessions at night. Harris County offers a continuation of the life skills class begun at boot camp 2 nights a week and a boot camp support group led by a licensed counselor 1 night a week. Hidalgo County offers weekly counseling and vocational preparation sessions. Parolees must attend each week for the first month after release, then every other week for the next 6 months. In addition, the aftercare program continues a community mentor program initiated during boot camp. Before graduation, family members and mentors join the offenders to discuss the aftercare plan.

Three juvenile programs. Like the local programs, the juvenile boot camps typically serve a narrow enough geographical area to facilitate some overlap in supervision and activities from boot camp to aftercare. Three of the 10 juvenile programs operate special boot camp aftercare programs. For two of these, the South Kortwright Youth Leadership Academy and City Challenge in New York and the Cuyahoga County Boot Camp Program in Cleveland, both boot camp and aftercare share a common director and program philosophy. The Cleveland program contractor, the North American Family Institute, promotes program integration by conducting joint staff training, applying the same disciplinary framework, and employing the same guided group interaction counseling sessions. The third program, the Environmental Youth Corps in Mobile, Alabama, splits responsibility for boot camp and aftercare between the Strickland Youth Center and the Boys and Girls Clubs of Mobile, but maintains continuity by assigning two probation officers for supervision of the youths for the entire program.

New York's juvenile boot camp lasts 6 months, followed by 3 months in City Challenge, an intensive day treatment program. While at City Challenge, youths participate in a New York City Board of Education school, family development programs, job preparation and placement programs, community involvement programs, as well as a counseling program begun in boot camp called the "Magic Within."

Cuyahoga County's program, while similar in structure, provides for only 3 months in boot camp, followed by up to 9 months in a phased aftercare program operating out of City Center, a downtown Cleveland center for boot camp graduates. Youths progress through three decreasing levels of supervision. During the first month they are transported to the City Center daily to attend an alternative educational academy. The next level of supervision frees the youths on weekends, and, if appropriate, allows them to attend their own schools. In the final stage, the youths must attend City Center 3 nights a week.

When youths are released from boot camp in Mobile, Alabama, they are assigned to one of the community's Boys and Girls Clubs for participation in life skills courses, social skills classes, tutoring, and recreational activities. The program also provides a weekly evening aftercare session at a designated Boys and Girls Club and supplemental offsite aftercare events. All boot camp graduates are placed on probation status with the Mobile Juvenile Court. They are required to report regularly to a probation officer and to fulfill any sentence requirements such as community service or restitution.

Continuity and interaction between boot camp and aftercare

If aftercare programs are to build on the behavioral, social, attitudinal, and educational gains that boot camps hope to produce, some informal links between the boot camp and aftercare would provide cross-fertilization of techniques, theoretical approaches, and information about individuals enrolled.

Program continuity can be maintained by carrying through a common philosophy or treatment approach in the boot camp and aftercare program, or it can occur through communication and joint planning. Except for the 13 programs described above that have developed some specialized services for boot camp graduates, none of the boot camp programs described anything other than minimal efforts to maintain a theoretical or programmatic link with aftercare. Programs that profess to maintain philosophical continuity, such as New York's Shock Incarceration Program and Cuyahoga County's Juvenile Boot Camp, articulate a theory of rehabilitation that is more than simply a military approach. This approach, without the military trappings, continues in the aftercare period. In addition, some boot camps transfer specific program components such as a life skills curriculum, a counseling approach, or a substance abuse treatment program to the community.

For the majority of the boot camps, however, integration of boot camp and aftercare consists of joint participation in prerelease planning. Some programs have made concerted efforts to facilitate communication and planning. For instance, the statewide programs in Maryland, New York, Oregon, and the California LEAD program have parole officers working at the boot camp to develop individualized release plans. In some cases these parole officers are responsible for monitoring the progress of the graduates in the community and serving as a liaison with the field agents as well. Some programs have made arrangements for field probation or parole officers to tour the boot camp facilities and, when distance is not a problem, to meet with individuals assigned to their caseloads. Oregon arranges for the parole agents to meet with the individuals to whom they have been assigned, either in person or by teleconference, before release.

The juvenile boot camps have most closely integrated the aftercare provisions with the boot camp. In the specialized programs, the links are very tight. In Mobile, the same probation officers who monitor youths during boot camp are also responsible for monitoring them upon release to the community. In Cuyahoga County, the boot camp and aftercare programs are operated by the same organization, producing common approaches, staffing, training, and monitoring.

In all of the other juvenile programs, integration efforts consist at a minimum of joint discussions of each youth before release. In Pinellas County a transition team continues to monitor the progress of youths monthly during their program participation.

Intensity and length of supervision

The length of the residential segment of the boot camp has important implications for the cost savings potential of the program and the requirements for aftercare supervision. The longer the camp, the more difficult it is to realize savings from reductions in the number of days institutionalized. However, the shorter camps may require aftercare in the community that is longer, more tightly supervised, and therefore more costly.

According to the survey, the length of the residential boot camps ranges from several weeks to 6 months. In many cases the minimum length of stay can be extended for 1 or 2 months. The minimum length of stay for 15 of the State programs is 3 months; 9 programs require 4-month stays; and 9 more require 6-month stays (see table 1, page 3). The local programs tend to be the shortest, with four of the programs requiring less than a 3-month stay. However, two local programs require 6 months. Most of the juvenile programs run 4 months.

Table 4: ***Supervision Initially Required by Program***

	Federal/State Programs (n=35)	Local Programs (n=8)[1]	Juvenile Programs (n=9)
Release all or majority of graduates to intensive supervision or day treatment	AZ[2], CA, GA-I, GA-P, IL, KS, LA, MD, MA, MI, NM, NH, NY, OH, OK-RID, PA, WI, FEDERAL 18	NY-Nassau County NY-Riker's Island TX-Travis TX-Harris 4	CA-LEAD FL-Leon County FL-Manatee County FL-Martin County FL-Pinellas NY-South Kortwright OH-Cuyahoga County 7
Release graduates to highest supervision level available in graduate's county	KY, OR 2	0	0
Release graduates to both intensive and standard supervision	CO, ID, MS, MT, NC, OK-SIP, TN, VA 8	MI-Pontiac TX-Hidalgo 2	0
Release majority of graduates to standard supervision	AL, AR, FL, NV, SC, TX, WY 7	TX-Brazos 1	AL-Mobile CO-Golden 2

[1] There is no community supervision required for those released from the Santa Clara, California, program.

[2] Applies to county probationers only. Shock releasees are usually placed in standard supervision.

Individuals graduating from boot camp are either released to the community on intensive or regular supervision, to a work release or other transitional facility, or rehoused in an institution (see table 4). Those who return to institutions were denied parole or are waiting for a hearing. In Santa Clara, California, those who have time left on their sentence return to standard incarceration.

For more than half of the programs, the majority of graduates are initially supervised at intensive levels. For two more programs, releasees are placed in intensive supervision if it is available in the county where a graduate lives. Specific intensive supervision requirements vary considerably across States. Relative to standard supervision within a given State, intensive supervision generally means that:

- Case workers have smaller case loads of between 15 and 30 parolees, instead of the usual load of between 60 and 100.

- Parolees are required to report in more frequently, in some cases every day.

- Parolees may be placed under house arrest, including electronic monitoring.

- Parolees may be subject to curfews, random urine checks, and employment verifications.

- Parolees are required to attend self-help or other counseling groups.

A period in a residential transitional program is required by the statewide programs in California, Michigan, and Ohio, and by the Travis County, Texas, local program, the Leon County, Florida, juvenile program, and the Federal Intensive Confinement Centers. Beginning in 1995, Florida's Basic Training Program also requires time in a residential transitional program under a mandate from the Florida legislature. The majority of the graduates of the Montana and Wisconsin boot camps enter a halfway house, but it is not a requirement.

A few programs offer transitional programming to certain types of offenders, e.g., drug offenders, or those with inappropriate home arrangements. All of the release centers offer supervision and programming in the evening and require the participants to work or participate in vocational training during the day. Some of the programs require a minimum stay in the work release program, while others set a maximum of anywhere from 15 days to 120 days. Florida's 4-month requirement is the longest.

Several of the juvenile programs arrange for participation in day treatment programs that provide extensive monitoring, but they are not designated as "intensive probation/parole."

After 3 to 6 months of intensive supervision, most parolees are placed on regular supervision for the balance of their sentences. In a few programs, the required period of intensive supervision may be much longer—up to 4 1/2 years for the Pennsylvania Boot Camp Program graduates. Ten programs place all or most of the boot camp graduates on regular parole/probation, and in 10 programs it depends on the individual case, with some graduates placed on both types of caseloads.

Transitional residential programs and intensive supervision offer opportunities to gradually reduce the intense supervision of boot camp as program graduates adjust to the community. For example, the Federal boot camps operated by the Bureau of Prisons offer three phases of progressively less structured supervision. During the first phase of aftercare, inmates are housed in a community corrections center. They may only leave the facility for employment or participation in special programs. During the next phase, they continue to live at the center, but may receive passes to visit family and friends. Finally, they are released to home confinement for the remainder of their sentences, under intensive supervision, and in some areas electronic surveillance. Those committing minor violations of the terms of their aftercare can be returned to an aftercare phase involving more intensive supervision.

Breadth and frequency of services

An aftercare program's effectiveness should increase if the program can arrange for treatment for substance abuse problems, provide vocational training and assistance in locating jobs, and continue counseling.

Although some researchers have proposed that programs should balance intensive surveillance and intensive services,[17] the programs surveyed generally emphasize the surveillance aspects of their aftercare provisions. Except for the 13 programs that provide separate, special arrangements for boot camp graduates, aftercare services provided to graduates of boot camp are similar to those provided to other inmates released from other facilities operated by the sponsoring agency. Some programs also mentioned that boot camp graduates have priority in receiving services. The types of services mentioned by aftercare providers usually include job placement and training programs or services, substance abuse treatment and counseling programs, and participation in self-help groups such as NA or AA. In some locations probation or parole officers are considered service brokers, responsible for identifying and arranging appropriate services for the client caseload. A few programs have additional activities such as parenting classes, mentor programs, GED preparation, and family counseling.

Monitoring and evaluation

Constant monitoring and evaluation of the boot camp and aftercare programs are essential to assess how they are working. Without good recordkeeping that follows boot camp graduates through aftercare and beyond, boot camps can have no way of knowing what does and does not work.

The survey found that responsibility for monitoring an individual's progress

usually shifts from the institution or agency running the boot camp to the probation or parole agency responsible for supervision in the community when the individual graduates. Routine feedback to the program, if any, consists of information about recidivism because of parole revocations or new crimes. However, simple recidivism data do not provide the type of information that would permit programs to identify shortcomings in the boot camp approach and to attempt to improve the preparation of program participants for release to the community. Few programs have the resources or interest to pursue the level of data collection that would permit this type of analysis. There are exceptions, such as the California Leadership, Esteem, Ability, and Discipline (LEAD) program operated by the California Youth Authority that is undertaking an elaborate evaluation, including extensive followup during the aftercare period.

Of the programs that reported recidivism statistics, the rates ranged from a low of 10 percent to a high of 35 percent. In all but one case, these reported rates were lower than those of a comparison group, which in most cases was the entire population released from prison. Without knowing how different the boot camp population is from the general prison population, these comparisons have limited significance. Nor is it possible to compare rates across programs because of differences in what constitutes recidivism and in the periods of time covered.

Conclusion

The aftercare arrangements for the full spectrum of boot camps are no different from those identified for boot camps that target substance abuse populations:[18] In both cases most programs release boot camp graduates to traditional probation and parole supervision. Of the 52 boot camp programs surveyed, only 13 programs have developed aftercare programs specifically targeted to the boot camp population. All but two of these programs are limited to that proportion of the boot camp graduates who reside in the major metropolitan areas. This means that for most boot camp graduates, boot camp ends upon graduation. Graduates are, in essence, starting over when they reach the community, employing techniques of behavior control and change that may be quite different from, and may possibly contradict, the strategies employed at boot camp.

The majority of those released from boot camp are placed on intensive probation/parole in their communities, but program representatives stressed the surveillance aspects of intensive supervision rather than intensive services. Thus, aftercare may fall short of the goal of identifying problem areas that could be addressed through a system of increasingly severe sanctions and arrangements for specific services.[19] Nor are there many programs that continue monitoring and evaluating graduates in aftercare.

The survey found, however, a number of models for integrating the aftercare functions with the boot camp. Some programs have taken advantage of the fact that a large proportion of the boot camp population resides in one or two locations and have developed special boot camp aftercare programs. Others have attempted to improve communication and planning during the transition to the community by developing a liaison between aftercare and boot camp. Some programs operate or refer boot camp graduates to transitional residential programs. Although this study did not uncover empirical evidence to assess the differential effectiveness of these techniques, they offer an array of ideas for those program planners attempting to strengthen the boot camp and aftercare links.

Notes

1. U.S. General Accounting Office, *Prison Boot Camps: Short-Term Prison Costs Reduced, But Long-Term Impact Uncertain*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1993.

2. MacKenzie, Doris L., and Claire Souryal, *Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1994.

3. Cowles, E.L., and T.C. Castellano, *Boot Camp Drug Treatment and Aftercare Interventions: An Evaluation Review*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1995.

4. The list of programs consulted came from three sources: State programs were identified from a 1993 survey AIR conducted of the 50 States and the District of Columbia to determine the number of operational and planned boot camps (Cronin, R.C., *Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1994); local programs were identified from Austin, J.M., M. Jones, and M. Bolyard, *The Growing Use of Jail Boot Camps: The Current State of the Art*, Research in Brief, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1993; and juvenile programs were identified from a survey conducted by the Institute for Criminological Research (1992). Since this

study was not addressing the prevalence of boot camps, no systematic attempt was made to determine if there were additional camps in operation.

5. Austin, J.M., M. Jones, and P. Bolyard, *The Growing Use of Jail Boot Camps: The Current State of the Art*.

6. Altschuler, D.M., and T.L. Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1994. Note, although these principles emerged from the study of juvenile programs, there is no reason to believe that they would not apply to the adult system as well.

7. Altschuler and Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*.

8. Georgia's Department of Corrections operates 2 types of boot camps, 1 for inmates and 1 for probationers in 9 facilities with a total capacity of 1,695. New York's program has a slightly higher operating capacity of 1,795, in 4 facilities. In addition, Georgia operates 10 probation detention facilities that offer short-term incarceration similar to boot camps. They were not included in this study because they do not have a military focus.

9. The State programs vary considerably in size ranging from Montana's small, 30-bed boot camp located in the Swan River Correctional Center to Georgia's or New York's multifacility programs.

10. The Kansas State legislature has set a mandatory 180-day period of intensive supervision for all boot camp graduates, but it had not taken effect at the time of this study.

11. Network is a therapeutic approach to enhancing decisionmaking skills to solve problems and to building self-esteem. In use in New York State beginning in 1978, the program is based on a 5-step model taught in 12 sessions. See Clark, Cherie L., David W. Aziz, and Doris L. MacKenzie, *Shock Incarceration in New York: Focus on Treatment*, Program Focus, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1994.

12. Parent, D., *Shock Incarceration: An Overview of Existing Programs*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1989.

13. Cronin, R.C., *Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders*. Cronin's report was the basis for identifying the boot camps for this project's survey. It identified boot camp programs in 29 States.

14. MacKenzie and Souryal, *Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration*.

15. Cronin, *Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders*.

16. MacKenzie and Souryal, *Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration*.

17. Altschuler and Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*.

18. Cowles and Castellano, *Boot Camp Drug Treatment and Aftercare Interventions: An Evaluation Review*.

19. Altschuler and Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*.

Blair B. Bourque is a senior research scientist with the American Institutes for Research (AIR), Mei Han is an associate research scientist, and Sarah M. Hill is a research associate with AIR. The study was supported under NIJ grant 92–DD–CX–K043.

A companion document, *An Inventory of Aftercare Provisions for 52 Boot Camp Programs*, summarizes each of the boot camp programs and is intended to serve as a resource document for those interested in learning about the specific aftercare arrangements and programs developed by each of the boot camps. It is available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service; call 800–851–3420, or e-mail askncjrs@ncjrs.aspensys.com; ask for NCJ 157104. Both of these documents can also be seen and downloaded from the NCJRS Bulletin Board System or ftp site and seen on the World Wide Web site. Contact NCJRS for more information.

Findings and conclusions of the research reported here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

NCJ 157664

The National Institute of Justice is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Related NIJ Publications

Listed below are selected additional NIJ publications related to boot camp issues. These publications can be obtained free from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS): telephone 800–851–3420, e-mail askncjrs@ncjrs.aspensys.com, or write to NCJRS, P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849–6000.

Please note that when free publications are out of stock, they are available in photocopies for a minimal fee or through interlibrary loan. They are also usually available electronically on the NCJRS Bulletin Board System or on the NCJRS Justice Information Center World Wide Web site for viewing or downloading. Contact NCJRS for more information.

Austin, James Ph.D., Michael Jones, and Melissa Bolyard, *The Growing Use of Jail Boot Camps: The Current State of the Art*, NIJ Research in Brief, 1993, NCJ 134708.

Bourque, Blair B., Roberta C. Cronin, Frank R. Pearson, Daniel M. Felker, Mei Han, and Sarah M. Hill, *Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders: An Implementation Evaluation of Three Demonstration Programs*, NIJ Research in Brief, 12 pages, 1996, NCJ 157317. The complete NIJ Research Report, 116 pages, is also available; ask for NCJ 157316.

Clark, Cheri L., David W. Aziz, and Doris L. MacKenzie, *Shock Incarceration in New York: Focus on Treatment*, NIJ Program Focus, 12 pages, 1994, NCJ 148410.

Cowles, Ernest L., Ph.D., Thomas C. Castellano, Ph.D., with the assistance of Laura A.Gransky, *"Boot Camp" Drug Treatment and Aftercare Intervention: An Evaluation Review*, NIJ Research in Brief, 16 pages, 1995, NCJ 155062. The complete Research Report, 184 pages, is also available; ask for NCJ 153918.

Cronin, Roberta C. with assistance of Mei Han, *Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders: Overview and Update*, NIJ Research Report, 68 pages, 1994, NCJ 149175.

MacKenzie, Doris Layton, Ph.D., and Eugene Hebert, editors, *Correctional Boot Camps: A Tough Intermediate Sanction*, NIJ Research Report, 19 chapters by different authors, 1995, NCJ 157639.

MacKenzie, Doris Layton, Ph.D., James W. Shaw, and Voncille B. Gowdy, NIJ Research in Brief, *An Evaluation of Shock Incarceration in Louisiana*, 1993, NCJ 140567.

MacKenzie, Doris Layton, Ph.D., and Claire Souryal, *Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration*, NIJ Research Report, 50 pages, 1994, NCJ 150062. A two-page summary is available as an NIJ Update, *Researchers Evaluate Eight Shock Incarceration Programs*.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/NIJ
Permit No. G–91